

## DETAILED ACTION

### Response to Amendments Claim 2 has been amended.

Claims 1-27 are pending examination.

### Response to Arguments

I. Applicant's arguments filed 6/30/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 15-19 and 26, Applicant argues that the cited prior art, *Edholm* (US 6,449,269) in view of *Swartz* (US 6,445,694), fail to teach the claimed limitation of “the CPU being programmed to receive the IP telephony user communications configuration selections from the user-interface device and in response to the received selections, programmably configure selected IP telephony device of an IP telephony communications system via the IP telephony communications link”.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated in the Non-Final rejection, *Swartz* teaches an internet-controlled telephony system wherein a subscriber makes communication configuration selections for the IP telephony device over a user-interface to the host services computer (*Abstract, Figure 1, col.2 lines 2-67, col.7 line 44-col.8 line 47, col.11 line 30-col.13 line 4*). The configuration selections made by the subscriber over the user-interface received by the CPU are used to configure the subscriber's IP telephony device (*Figures 2, 6, 8 and 9, col.3 lines 39-59*). These teachings cited from *Swartz* fulfill the functionality of the claim language therefore the rejection under the cited prior art is maintained.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 20, Applicant argues that the cited prior art, *Shaffer et al* (US 6,125,108) in view of *Truetken* (US 6,493,324), fail to teach “programming both a control center and a computer processor circuit at each of the plurality of IP telephony devices”.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. *Shaffer et al* clearly disclose using a user's service profile to configure the user's IP telephony device, which configures the server to enable the particular call services needed by the user (*Figures 4-6, col.4 lines 1-28*). Thus the server uses the user's service profile and selected menu options to enable the specific services chosen to configure the IP telephony device. These teachings cited from *Shaffer et al* fulfill the functionality of the claim language therefore the rejection under the cited prior art is maintained.

#### CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 103

**II.** The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**III.** **Claims 15-19 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edholm (US 6,449,269) in view of Swartz (US 6,445,694).**

a. **Per claim 15**, *Edholm* teaches a user-programmable communications arrangement comprising:

- a user-interface device having a display, the device being programmed to provide IP telephony communications configuration information to a user via the display and to communicate IP telephony communications configuration selections from the user to a CPU (*Abstract, col.4 line 65-col.5 line 8, col.5 lines 36-52—IP telephone with user interface display for communicating user-selections*); and
- a programmable CPU communicatively coupled to the user interface device and having an OOP interface coupled to an IP telephony communications link, the CPU being adapted to receive the IP telephony communication selections from

the user-interface device (*col.2 lines 33-67, col.3 lines 8-48, col.4 lines 24-61, col.8 lines 39-49—user interface display on IP telephony device coupled to a phone server for receiving call information selections by user*).

*Edholm* fails to explicitly teach the CPU being programmed to receive the IP telephony user communications configuration selections from the user-interface device and in response to the received selections, programmably configure selected IP telephony device of an IP telephony communications system via the IP telephony communications link. However, *Swartz* teaches an internet-controlled telephony system wherein a subscriber makes communication configuration selections for the IP telephony device over a user-interface to the host services computer (*Abstract, Figure 1, col.2 lines 2-67, col.7 line 44-col.8 line 47, col.11 line 30-col.13 line 4*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of *Edholm* with *Swartz* by providing a user interface that displays the IP telephony options available to the user in order to efficiently allow user-friendly configuration input selection from the IP telephone device to be communicated to the host service provider in order to maintain the preferred service for each user's telephony device.

b. **Per claim 16**, *Edholm* with *Swartz* teaches the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 15, *Swartz* further teaches wherein the CPU is programmed to control the scope of IP telephony communications configuration selections that can be made by a particular user (*col.4 line 43-col.5 line 36, col.7 line 44-col.8 line 47, col.11 line 23-col.12 line 16*).

c. **Per claim 17**, *Edholm* with *Swartz* teaches the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 15, *Swartz* further teaches wherein the IP telephony

system includes a memory storage device having user-access configuration data, wherein the CPU receives the configuration data for controlling the scope of configuration selections that can be made by a particular user (*col.2 lines 32-67, col.3 lines 1-37, col.7 lines 46-61, col.11 lines 1-21*).

d. **Per claim 18**, *Edholm* with *Swartz* teach the user-programmable communications controller of claim 17, *Swartz* further teaches wherein the memory storage device is programmed to send display information to the user-interface device using OOP, the display information including available IP telephony communications selections (*col.7 lines 46-61*).

e. **Per Claim 19**, *Edholm* with *Swartz* teach the user-programmable communications controller of claim 15, *Swartz* further teaches wherein the user-interface device communication the configuration selections using the OOP (*Abstract, col.2 lines 2-67, col.7 line 44-col.8 line 47, col.11 line 30-col.13 line 4*).

f. **Per claim 26**, *Edholm* with *Swartz* teaches the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 15, *Edholm* further teaches wherein the CPU is programmed to control selected functions of selected IP telephony devices of an IP telephony communications system by configuring a plurality of IP telephony devices (*col.2 lines 52-57, col.5 lines 20-24; Swartz—col.4 line 43-col.5 line 36, col.7 line 44-col.8 line 47, col.11 line 23-col.12 line 16*).

IV. **Claims 1-14, 20-25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Shaffer et al* (US 6,125,108) in view of *Truetken* (US 6,493,324).**

a. **Per claim 1**, *Shaffer et al* teach for use in a IP telephony system in which a control center is communicatively coupled to a plurality of IP telephony devices, a user-programmable communications arrangement comprising:

- a user interface for at least one of: user control of a IP telephony device, office telephone administration control of a plurality of telephony devices, and system administrator control of telephony system configuration (*col.3 line 57-col.4 line 8, col.8 lines 5-11—inherent interface for entering user data to transmit request on IP telephone using menu of call service features to create service profile for controlling and configuring each IP telephony device via a server*); and
- a programmable controller programmed to, responsive to a user selecting one of the configuration options, to program the control center and a computer processor circuit at each of the plurality of IP telephony devices and to control communications between the control center and the plurality of IP telephony devices (*col.3 line 57-col.4 line 28, col.5 lines 8-17—user service profile for configuring service features for each IP telephony device via a server*).

*Shaffer et al* teach users transmitting requests on the IP telephones which inherently involves a user interfaces, yet *Shaffer et al* fail to explicitly teach a user interface to display IP telephony configuration options. However, *Truetken* teaches that IP telephones equipped with user interfaces that display IP telephony options and settings selectable by the user (*Figures 3-6, col.2 line 64-col.3 lines 37*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* by providing a user interface that displays the IP telephony options available to the user in order to efficiently allow user-friendly configuration input on the IP telephone device.

b. **Claim 20** contains limitations that are substantially equivalent to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Per claim 2**, *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* teach the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 1, *Truetken* further teaches wherein the programmable controller is programmed, in response to configuration options received from the user interface, communicate programming data to an IP telephony device to program the computer processor circuit at the IP telephony device to respond to an incoming call by announcing via the display, the call announce being effected without overtaking currently-running program applications at the IP telephony device, and wherein at least the user interface is a part of a programmed computer (*col.1 lines 50-55, col.3 lines 20-31 and 58-62; Shaffer et al—Figures 4-6, col.2 lines 2-12, col.3 lines 49-67, col.4 lines 1-28*).

d. **Claim 25** is substantially similar to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

e. **Per claim 3**, *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* teach the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 2, *Truetken* further teaches wherein the call announce is effected using a locally-installed OOP applet that runs in the background of the computer (*col.3 line 51-col.4 line 14*).

f. **Per claim 4**, *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* teach the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 2, *Truetken* further teaches wherein the call announce displays user control options including at least one of: caller ID, speaker phone, answer, forward to voicemail, hold, and call termination (*col.1 lines 50-55, col.3 lines 20-31 and 58-62; Shaffer et al—col.1 lines 11-18*).

g. **Per claim 5**, *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* teach the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 1, *Truetken* further teaches wherein the user interface includes a graphic user interface (GUI) (*col.2 lines 64-67, col.3 lines 20-25*).

h. **Per claim 6**, *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* teach the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 1, *Truetken* further teaches wherein the computer includes one of the plurality of IP telephony devices (*col.2 lines 50-67; Shaffer et al—col.2 lines 2-12, col.3 lines 49-67*).

i. **Per claim 7**, *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* teach the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 1, *Shaffer et al* further teach wherein the controller is programmed to access personal contact information (*col.2 lines 2-27, col.3 line 57-col.4 line 27; Truetken—col.3 line 52-col.4 line 33*).

j. **Per claim 8**, *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* teach the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 7, *Truetken* further teaches wherein the personal contact information is arranged in a searchable database accessible by the controller, the database being accessible via user-defined shuffle search statements (*col.4 lines 2-4, 20-22 and 28-33—personal directory and phone/address book; Shaffer et al —col.4 lines 20-23 and 47-52, col.5 lines 45-52, col.6 lines 31-48*).

k. **Per claim 9**, *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* teach the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 1, *Shaffer et al* further teaches wherein the controller is programmed to provide a control interface for system administration control of an IP telephony network, the interface being programmed to provide at least one of: IP telephony system configuration and system status information (*col.3 lines 14-20; Truetken—col.3 lines 59-62*).

l. **Per claim 10**, *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* teach the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 9, *Shaffer et al* further teaches wherein the IP telephony system status information includes at least one of: IP address assignment information for telephony devices, user-access security control level settings, current telephony device hardware settings, display settings for the controller, and telephony device location information (*col.4 lines 13-52—telephony address information*).

m. **Per claim 11**, *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* teach the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 9, *Truetken* further teaches wherein the controller is programmed to control at least one of: telephony device address assignment, user-access permissions, system report generation, display settings for the controller, voice mail parameters, IP telephony device hardware configuration, system backups, call routing protocol, call accounting, email configuration settings and call logging (*col.3 lines 8-37, col.4 lines 2-6, col.5 lines 1-5; Shaffer et al—col.4 lines 13-52*).

n. **Per claim 12**, *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* teach the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 1, *Truetken* further teaches wherein the controller is programmed to configure the control center and the plurality of IP telephony devices using OOP for providing the user-selected IP telephony configuration information to the control center (*col.3 lines 20-37; Shaffer et al—col.4 lines 1-12*).

o. **Per claim 13**, *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* teach the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 1, *Truetken* further teaches wherein user control of an IP telephony device includes active call control and call receive settings including at least one of: speaker phone activation, call answer, call forward to voicemail, call forward to another number

or IP telephony address, call hold, call termination, display of caller ID, speed dial, call transfer, redial, voicemail forwarding, voicemail messaging, multi-party calling call muting, video control, and remote access control for remote access to telephony services (*col.1 lines 50-55, col.3 lines 15-31 and 58-62; Shaffer et al—col.1 lines 16-19, col.3 lines 57-64*).

p. **Per claim 14**, *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* teach the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 1, *Truetken* further teaches wherein each of the plurality of IP telephony devices includes a CPU, and wherein the user interface and controller are further programmed to: provide user-selected email configuration information to a control center communicatively coupled to each CPU; display a control interface for at least one of: user control of email configuration, office administration control of the plurality of CPUs, and system administrator control of email system configuration; and the email configuration information being selected to control communications between, and to programmably configure, the control center and the plurality of CPUs (*col.2 line 50-col.3 line 45*).

q. **Per claim 21**, *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* teach the user-programmable communications control system of claim 20, *Truetken* further teaches wherein the scope of communications control selections that can be made at the computer station is controlled by the programmable communications server based on a predefined user-access permission level (*col.4 lines 2-12*).

r. **Claim 27** is substantially similar to claim 21 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

s. **Per claim 22**, *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* teach the user-programmable communications control system of claim 20, *Truetken* further teaches the system further

comprising a plurality of computer stations, wherein programmable communications server is programmed to receive communications control selections from each of the plurality of computer stations (*col.4 lines 2-40, col.5 lines 1-21; Shaffer et al —col.3 line 57-col.4 line 12*).

t. **Per claim 23**, *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* teach the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 1, *Truetken* further teaches the arrangement further including the control center, wherein the programmable controller is programmed to configure the control center by providing configuration information to control interactions between the control center and each of the plurality of IP telephony devices, the plurality of IP telephony devices being remote from the programmable controller (*col.4 lines 2-40, col.5 lines 1-21; Shaffer et al —col.3 line 57-col.4 line 12*).

u. **Per claim 24**, *Shaffer et al* with *Truetken* teach the user-programmable communications arrangement of claim 1, *Truetken* further teaches the arrangement further including the control center, wherein the programmable controller is programmed to configure each of the plurality of IP telephony devices via communications with the control center (*col.4 lines 2-40, col.5 lines 1-21; Shaffer et al —col.3 line 57-col.4 line 28*).

### Conclusion

V. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure: Pickett (2002/0001302), Zirngibl et al (6445694), Ramey et al (7111056), Baniak et al (7103165), Platt et al (6757363), Lamb et al (6747970), Sollee et al (6614899).

**VI.** Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

**VII.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KRISTIE D. SHINGLES whose telephone number is (571)272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday 9:00am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on 571-272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2444

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Kristie D. Shingles*

*Examiner*

*Art Unit 2444*

*/KDS/*

*/William C. Vaughn, Jr./*

*Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444*